

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants note the specification is amended to correct minor informalities. The changes to the specification are not believed to raise any issues of new matter.

Claims 1-5, 8-14, and 16-25 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 7, and 15 are canceled by the present response without prejudice. Claims 3, 4, and 25 stand withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 20-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 1,864,093 to Prince. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Prince in view of U.S. patent 2,878,048 to Peterson. Claims 6, 7, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Prince in view of U.S. patent 6,619,435 to Watzke et al. (herein "Watzke"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Prince in view of U.S. patent 1,952,766 to Mazer. Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Prince. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Prince in view of U.S. patent 4,269,380 to Shima et al. (herein "Shima").

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

The claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now further recites "the tail cord being formed of a flat cable", "the arm part having a through-hole in the opening of the tail-cord duct", and "a governor rope arranged in the opening of the tail-cord duct so as to extend along the elevating space, the governor rope passing through the through-hole of the arm part". The other independent claims are similarly amended. Such features are believed to be fully supported by the original specification, see as a non-limiting example Figure 3 in the present

specification showing the arm part 10 including a through-hole opening 12 through which a governor rope 13 passes.

The claims as currently written are directed to an elevator that as one benefit can prevent a tail cord from projecting out of a tail-cord duct due to the influence of ambient wind. Such an elevator has a passenger car with a tail cord of a flat cable extending therefrom. As shown in the background art of Figure 1 in the present specification, when a tail cord 106 is subjected to an air current flowing through the opening 104, the tail cord 106 may flutter, and the behavior of the tail cord 106 becomes complicated with a torsional deformation as the tail cord 106 has a flat cross-section. Since the tail cord 106 is formed of a flat cable, the drooping portion of the tail cord (a portion under the arm part 105 in Figure 1) may be torsionally deformed. When the tail cord 106 recovers from such a torsional deformation, the tail cord 106 may be reversely and torsionally deformed. Thus, the tail cord 106 may rotate about its longitudinal axis. In such a situation if the opening 104 has a width larger than the width of the tail cord 106, the tail cord 106 may flow out through the opening 104, as shown by the two-dotted line in Figure 1.

The present invention can address such a situation in a background art.

In the claimed invention, and with reference to Figures 3 and 4 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a governor rope 13 is arranged in an opening 6 of a tail-cord duct 5 so as to extend along an elevating space, and the governor rope 13 passes through a through-hole 12 of an arm part 10. Further, the leading end of the arm part 10 is shifted from the opening 6 of the tail-cord duct 5 in a duct-width direction connecting one plane position of duct side suspending position with another plane position of the free end of the tail cord 11, and thereby the free end of the tail cord 11 is carried by the leading end of the art part 10.

With such structures, the tail cord can be effectively prevented from projecting out through the opening 6. Further, when the tail cord swings towards the opening 6, the tail cord can be effectively prevented from passing out through the opening 6 by the governor rope 13 arranged in the opening 6 and passing through the through-hole 12 of the arm part 10.

The structure as currently recited in the claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

In each of the rejections noted above Prince is cited as the primary reference. Prince discloses an elevator construction with a vertical sheath or chute 18 accommodating a traveling cable 12. First, in Prince the traveling cable 12 has a round cross-section, in contrast to the claims as currently written. Thereby, the traveling cable 12 simply swings due to air current flowing through the opening 19, and does not have a complicated behavior as in a flat cable. Prince thereby does not disclose or suggest the claimed “the tail cord being formed of a flat cable.” Moreover, as a result of Prince utilizing a round traveling cable 12, in Prince there is no significant need to prevent the traveling cable 12 from passing out through the opening 19. Thus, Prince does not suffer from the same drawback that the present inventors recognized in the background art, and Prince does not disclose any structure to prevent such a drawback.

Along those lines, Prince also does not disclose or suggest a governor rope arranged in an opening of a tail-cord duct so as to extend along an elevating space, and Prince clearly does not disclose or suggest a governor rope passing through a through-hole of an arm part.

In such ways, the claims recite structural features neither taught nor suggested by Prince. Further, in view of such structural differences Prince also does not suffer from drawbacks to which the present invention prevents, and Prince thereby would not have been modified to meet such claim limitations.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written clearly distinguish over Prince.

Moreover, no teachings in any of these secondary cited references to Peterson, Watske, Mazer, or Shima are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies in Prince.

In view of the foregoing comments and the presently submitted claim amendments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over the applied art.


Applicants also note with respect to withdrawn claims 3, 4, and 25, claims 3 and 4 depend on independent claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is clearly generic to dependent claims 3 and 4, and claims 3 and 4 are believed to be clearly allowable. Also, withdrawn independent claim 25 is amended similarly as in independent claim 1 noted above. Independent claim 1 is thereby still believed to be generic to withdrawing claim 25.

Thereby, the reinstatement of withdrawn claims 3, 4, and 25 is believed to be proper, and those claims are allowable for similar reasons as noted above.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No. 28,870
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

I:\ATTYSNS\246324US-AM.DOC